DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 256 020 EA 017 643

AUTHOR Hathaway, Walter E.
TITLE Managing School Districts in a Decade of Decline.
PUB DATE Dec 81
NOTE 22p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Budgeting; Cooperative Programs; *Cost Estimates; Educational Planning; *Educational Strategies; Elementary Secondary Education; *Financial Problems; Money Management; Politics of Education; Program Budgeting; *Resource Allocation; *Retrenchment; School Community Relationship
IDENTIFIERS Portland School District OR

ABSTRACT

Due to enrollment decline, reductions in federal support, and declining state support because of a constricted economy, growing inflation, expanding government and legal requirements, and the loss of public confidence in education, the Portland School District (Oregon) developed a short-term contingency budget planning process in fiscal 1980-81 to deal with threatened but uncertain revenue shortfall. This paper describes this process and explores five long-term creative approaches to reducing the cost of schooling without impeding progress toward a more equitable and effective educational system. These approaches include (1) increased self-directed learning for students; (2) development of an extensive work experience program; (3) setting minimum requirements for effort and performance of students beyond the eighth (and possibly the sixth) grade to justify public expenditure for their education; (4) extended cooperative relations of school systems with community colleges and universities; and (5) more extensive relations with cultural institutions, service agencies, businesses, and individuals who are potential educational resources. References are included, along with two foldout budget-reduction charts. (TE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED256020

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Walter E. Hathaway
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Managing School Districts in a Decade of Decline

Walter E. Hathaway
Portland (OR) Public Schools

December, 1981

EA 017 643

INTRODUCTION

As we move into a decade of decline school districts must prepare to make effective short and long range management responses to growing revenue uncertainty and reduction. Increasingly, we find ourselves entering the annual budget planning process with uncertain knowledge of the level of revenue that will be available to us, but with well founded expectations that resources will be severely restricted. The causes for this decline in revenues include enrollment reverses, the hectic implementation of the New Federalism's block grant program and the accompanying reductions in the level of Federal support, declining state support in the face of a constricted economy, growing inflation, expanding government and legal requirements and regulations, and finally, loss of public confidence in education, which has eroded public support for schooling at all levels, federal, state and local.

This paper will:

- Describe the short-term contingency budget planning process used by the Portland School District in fiscal 1980-81 to meet the problem of threatened but uncertain revenue shortfall.

- Explore alternative long-term creative approaches to reducing the cost of schooling to match dwindling revenue without impeding continued progress toward more equitable and effective student learning.

Contingency Budget Planning

Too often school districts find themselves in the position of needing to react swiftly to developing financial crises. Such responses often are made more quickly and less creatively and effectively than would be the case if there were more time for deliberation. In early 1981 the Portland Public School system found itself facing a potential deficit of over $22 million in a "hold the line" budget for the 1981-82 fiscal year if the "worst case" federal, state and local revenue projections were realized. The actual revenue levels would not be learned until late Spring at the earliest, far past the time when all but the final stages of the budget planning process with its extensive community involvement must be completed. In order to create a budget in a timely fashion in this climate of uncertain revenue the District developed and used a technique for contingency budget planning to allow the community, Board and staff the time necessary to plan innovative and carefully considered responses to the resource limitations that might finally be imposed. The importance of this sort of effort will be magnified as we move further into this decade of uncertain federal, state and local revenue levels.

In the Spring of 1981, following reductions by the Board of over $9 million from an initial "hold the line" budget projection, the District still faced a 1981-82 operating fund deficit of approximately $13.2 million. This figure was derived from the following potential revenue reductions:

. Potential State Reductions	- $ 5,900,000
. Potential Federal Rescissions	- $ 4,100,000
. Unrealized 1980-81 Net Working Capital Carryover Projections	- $ 2,500,000
. Unrealized School Closures/Consolidations Savings Projections	- $ 700,000
	$13,200,000

In order to plan to deal with this threatened shortfall the administration prepared for Board use a contingency planning process that had four main goals:

- Assisting the Board in identifying and prioritizing the program and support service cuts that would be carried out when the actual revenue shortfall was known;

- Influencing pending state and federal decisions that would affect the final actual revenue shortfall;

- Assisting the Board in setting the amount of a planned B ballot levy election; and

- Informing the public of the nature of the service reductions that would result from failure to pass an A or B ballot so that they might take them into consideration in deciding how to vote in the levy election.

This planning process was developed by the superintendent and his staff with the collaborative support of the financial planning and policy evaluation units. It involved:

- Intense and creative staff work to identify areas for potential reductions and to recommend their amounts and priorities; (e.g., shift to a 4 day school week.)

- Careful and extensive collection and use of information on the wishes of the community in making the decisions. (Over 100 citizen advisory groups were involved.)

- A determined effort to protect all important elements of classroom instruction to the greatest extent possible.

The contingency planning process acknowledged that the District must provide:

- A safe and appropriate physical and psychological environment for all students and staff;

- An educational program which meets ODE Minimum Standards for Elementary and Secondary Schools;

- Service to students with special needs as required by legislative or judicial mandates; avoidance of differential impact of budgetary decisions on students from low socioeconomic backgrounds;

- Honoring of legal/contractual obligations; and

- Provision of support services and management functions necessary to meet ODE Minimum Standards for Elementary and Secondary Schools, safety ordinances, legislative and judicial mandates and legal/contractual agreements.

It was also acknowledged, however, that it would be impossible to push $13.2 million deeper into the 1981-82 budget without jeopardizing the district's capacity to honor these principles both in spirit and in fact since the originally projected 1981-82 operating budget had already been reduced by Board action by approximately $9 million. To cut deeper now, could only mean severe compromises in the quality of the District's educational programs and

support services. To pretend otherwise would have been naive and misleading to the public, in general, and to the federal and state governments, in particular.

In order to place the required contingency planning in perspective, the following summary of the District's 1981-82 budget may be useful:

. Direct Instruction	$114 million	69.2%
. Operation and Maintenance of Plant	27 million	16.6%
. Transportation	6 million	4.0%
. Central Administration Board Audit Staff Legal	3.492 million	2.0%
. Central Business Support	3.7 million	2.3%
. Other Central Services Data Processing Personnel Evaluation CIR Grants	3.471 million	2.0%
. Contingency	5.351 million	3.2%
. Miscellaneous	1.379 million	.7%
TOTAL	$164,393 million	100.0%

The Board of Education's task was to find over $13 million of potential cutbacks from this already lean budget while causing the least possible harm to its educational mission. Summaries of the two key contingency planning documents provided to the Board to help them carry out that task are presented on the following pages. The first was the chart on Federal Revenue Shortfall and the second was the Budget Reduction Chart. In addition detailed descriptive commentaries related to each element of both charts were prepared and given to the Board members.

ADMINISTRATIVE
CONTINGENCY PLANNING
POTENTIAL 1981-82
FEDERAL REVENUE SHORTFALL

PART A: REDUCTION/NON REPLACEMENT OF FEDERALLY SUPPORTED PROGRAMS AND/OR SERVICES

Recommendation: General fund monies should not replace reductions in supplementary federal funds except for the allocation of a contingency fund of $200,000 to help meet the needs of severely handicapped Portland students who may no longer have available state funded regional services (see attached Grant Information Sheets for detailed information on indicated programs/services).

		(FY 81 RESCISSION)																					FY 82 BUDGET			
		TITLE I						TITLE IV - C					PL 94-142														
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13 HANDICAPPED CHILD PROJECT					14 SPECIAL SERVICES			15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	TOTALS
A	Project	Disavantaged Child	Preschool Early Childhood Education	Handicapped	Neglected/ Delinquent	Multi-handicapped	Title IV-B Instructional Media	Cooperative Agency Rehabilitation Effort	Motivational & Attitudinal Change for the Exceptional Child	Reading Disability Program for 5 year olds	Follow Through	Desegregation For Equal Education Opportunity Title VI	Portland Handicapped (Basic Grant)	Emanuel	Autistic	Providence	Child Neurology	Regional Deaf	Regional Blind	Regional Physically Handicapped	P.L. 91-230 ACT	P.L. 91-230 AIM	ESEA Title VII Asian Bilingual Education	Law Related Education	Talented & Gifted	Corp. for Public Broadcasting	Vocational Education	CETA	Child Nutrition	Impact Aid	
B	Current Budget Allocation (1980-81)	$ 5,052,351	215,356	516,212	135,800	117,011	224,887	50,023	46,057	21,166	302,408	336,766	580,[illegible]8	15,701	126,531	48,800	20,544	257,099	119,542	106,925	195,873	95,715	170,374	42,128	29,550	119,580	532,167	1,368,412	2,708,087	195,000	$13,750,313
C	Potential Worst Case Reduction	$ 1,263,088	53,839	129,053	33,900	29,253	56,222	22,226	31,300	10,582	150,000	170,000	145,112	3,925	31,632	12,200	5,136	64,275	29,886	26,731	–	23,929	42,593	10,532	9,837	19,580	133,042	809,216	601,563	195,000	$4,143,452
D	Potential Best Case Reduction	$ 303,141	12,921	2,065	8,136	500	28,111	11,113	15,650	5,291	37,801	42,096	44,694	1,209	9,743	3,750	1,582	19,797	9,205	8,233	–	11,964	21,297	5,266	3,894	19,580	66,521	410,524	300,000	(General Fund Revenue) 195,000	$ 1,598,884
E	District General Fund and Other Non Federal Revenues Devoted to Same Function	District $500,000 State Disadvantaged $1,000,000	2,314,452 (1,527,469 is Deseg Plan ECE)	(See PL 94-142, 12)	—	(See PL 94-142, 12)	3,671,257	—	—	—	—	679,855 Office of Deseg/Integ 596,423 AT and Transport 2,511,887 (See Preschool, 2) Deseg Plan 3,791,766 Total	11,369,303	←	←	←	←	←	←	←	–	–	4,329,275	23,579	340,790	321,549	1,554,238	30,820 (Coordinator)	——	—	——
F	Administrative[1] Recommendations	NR	NR	NR	NR	*	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	[illegible]	*	*	*	*	NR	*	*	*	NR	*	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	$ 200,000
																															Total Federal Reductions Not to be replaced from General Funds[2] $ 3,943,452

[1] NR = Non-Replacement
* = General Fund Replacement

[2] Child nutrition deficit to be recovered from increased meal charges to students

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Portland Public Schools
1981 — 1982
Budget Reduction Chart

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Increments	Administrative Priority (In descending order)	Congruence with Citizen Priority H — High M — Moderate L — Low	Option #1 / Option #2 / Option #3 — A Non-Instructional Support: Description	A Non-Instructional Support: Amount	B Instructional Support: Description	B Instructional Support: Amount	C Instruction: Description	C Instruction: Amount	Total: Ascending Balance	Comments
	1	H	Close, consolidate schools	1,300,000					1,300,000	
	2	H	Reduce cleaning in schools	1,500,000					2,800,000	See Priority 30
	3	M	Reduce maintenance	1,500,000					4,300,000	See Priority 31
5,050,000	4	M	Reduce transportation costs (stagger opening, closing school times)	750,000					5,050,000	See Priority 27
	5	H			Reduce central area support services	2,202,000			7,252,000	See Priority 33
	6	H			Extend instructional material adoption cycle to 8 yrs	765,000			8,017,000	A second year of similar savings can be achieved by extending the cycle to 8 years
	7	H			Reduce Educational Media expenditures (exclusive of textbooks)	250,000			8,267,000	See Priority 32
	8	M			Reduce District contribution to private alternative schools	46,000			8,313,000	See Priority 22
	9	H			Reduce extended responsibility stipends	300,000			8,613,000	See Priority 35 Does not include athletics; see Priorities 18 and 38
	10	M					Reorganize Work Experience Program	500,000	9,113,000	Program continues but is reorganized through merger with counseling and guidance services
	11	H					Reduce Driver Education Program	14,000	9,127,000	Reduces District cost by one half See Priority 26
	12	H			Reduce Desegregation Support Services	144,000			9,271,000	See Priority 50
	13	H	Reduce Community use of buildings	250,000					9,521,000	Go to fee system (1/2 of cost) See Priority 29
	14	L			Eliminate 4-H Program	21,000			9,542,000	
	15	M					Reduce ECEC Special Support	100,000	9,642,000	See Priority 47
	16	M			Reduce KBPS	63,000			9,705,000	20% Reduction See Priority 37
	17	H					Reduce Teacher Released Time	200,000	9,905,000	See Priority 34
10,030,000	18	H			Reduce Interscholastic team athletics	125,000			10,030,000	See Priority 36
	19	H					Increase Pupil/Teacher			Grades From To FTE Increase

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

											6-8 185 190 5 9-12 176 190 14 a) PK-K no change b) H S ratio change tied to present FTE by high school See Priority 41
	20	H			Eliminate four individual [illegible] Gymnastics Swimming Golf Tennis	43,000 59,000 25,000 48,000			12,553,000	See Priority 24
	21	NA			Eliminate District Match to State Disadvantaged Funds	500,000			13,053,000	
	22	NA			Eliminate District contribution to private alternative schools	An additional 46,000 beyond the 46,000 in Priority 6			13,099,000	See Priority 8
	23	H			Eliminate field trips (PK-12)	102,000			13,201,000	
	24	H			Eliminate two additional interscholastic sports Wrestling Girl's Softball	104,000 75,000			13,380,000	See Priority 20
	25	L	Reduce Word Processing	32,000					13,412,000	
	26	H					Eliminate Driver Educa Program	Additional $14,000 beyond the $14,000 in Priority 11	13,426,000	
15,357,000	27	NA	Shift to 4 day school week in addition to staggered opening/closing times	Transportation 1,326,000 Utilities 605,000					15,357,000	See Priority 4
	28	H	Reduce minor building improvements	77,000					15,434,000	
	29	H	Eliminate community use of buildings	An additional $250,000 beyond the $250,000 in Priority 13					15,684,000	See Priority 13
	30	H	Further reduce cleaning in schools	An additional $1,500,000 beyond the $1,500,000 in Priority 2					17,184,000	See Priority 2
	31	L	Further reduce maintenance	An additional $1,500,000 beyond the $1,500,000 in Priority 3					18,684,000	See Priority 3
	32	L			Further reduce Educational Media expenditures (exclusive of textbooks)	450,000			19,134,000	See Priority 7
21,136,000	33	H			Further reduce Central Area Support Services	2,002,000			21,136,000	See Priority 5
	34	H					Further reduce teacher released time	200,000	21,336,000	See Priority 17
	35	H			Further reduce extended responsibility stipends	An additional $400,000 beyond				

						beyond line $300,000 in Priority 9			21,736,000	See Priority 9
	36	H					Eliminate K-8 programs (Music P E Ind. Ed. Home Ec (Exclusive of Middle Schools)	3,100,000	24,836,000	See Priority 40 (and 19)
5,079,000	37	M			Eliminate KBPS	Additional $243,000 beyond $63,000 in Priority 18			25,079,000	See Priority 18
	38	H			Further reduce interscholastic athletics	Additional $248,000 beyond $125,000 in Priority 18			25,327,000	See Priority 18
	39	H					Reduce alternative District educational programs	170,000	25,497,000	
	40	H			Eliminate sub-urban Transfer Program	150,000			25,647,000	
	41	H					Further increase Pupil/Teacher (FTE) Ratio	An additional 1,500,000 beyond Priority 19	27,147,000	See Priority 19 Add .5 Grades 3-5 (to 21.5); add .5 grades 6-8 (to 19.5); add 1.0 Grades 9-12 (to 20.0) - (H.S. FTE ratio change tied to present FTE by school)
	42	H					Reduce kindergarten	1,210,000	28,357,000	Eliminate Kindergarten (with exception ECEC and Comprehensive Desegregation Program identified sites)
	43	M					Eliminate "CATCH" Program	64,000	28,421,000	
	44	M					Reduce Vocational Education (10%)	163,000	28,584,000	
	45	H					Reduce Career Education (10%)	23,000	28,607,000	
	46	L	Reduce after school transportation	171,000					28,778,000	
	47	H					Further reduce ECEC Special Support	An additional $100,000 beyond $100,000 in Priority 15	28,878,000	See Priority 15
	48	H					Reduce Discipline Specialists	230,000	29,108,000	
	49	H	Reduce School Police	62,000					29,170,000	
	50	H			Further reduce Desegregation Support Services	Additional $144,000 beyond $144,000 in Priority 12			29,314,000	See Priority 12
COPY AVAILABLE			A Non-Instructional Support	T$10,823,000	B Instructional Support	T$8,555,000	C Instruction	T$9,936,000		GT$29,314,000

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

After considering the Federal Revenue Shortfall information the Board decided on a policy of non-replacement of the final actual loss of a potential $3.9 million in federally supported programs except for $200,000 to support severely handicapped students who could no longer be accommodated in discontinued regional programs.

The second body of information that was considered by the Board is summarized in the Budget Reduction Chart. Here, 50 administratively prioritized program reductions totalling over $29 million were presented for the Board's consideration in deciding what reductions to make if part or all of the potential shortfall of over $13 million was realized. Thus, sufficient "flex" was provided to allow a wide range for Board choice in creating optional solutions in the face of the budget shortfalls. The Board had strong support and wide discretion in deciding what level to establish for the B ballot and what to "replace" if the A and/or B ballots failed to pass. A third and final chart which summarizes the $15.6 million in prioritized contingency reductions that the Board actually elected to make, is to be found on the next page.

While the contingency budget planning process described above by no means solved all the District's financial problems, it did prove a valuable management tool in responding to the financial crises in a professional and responsible manner. The most dramatic indicator of the worth of such a planning effort was the overwhelming passage of both the A and B ballot portions of a levy by citizens in response to the Board's clear presentation of the specific program and services that would have to be curtailed or eliminated if local resources were not increased. This communication and response was made possible in large measure by the contingency planning effort.

Administrative Contingency Planning: Potential 1981-1982 Revenue Shortfall

Part B: Reduction/Elimination of General Fund Portior Of Selected Programs and/or Services

PROPOSED ADMINISTRATIVE PRIORITY	ITEM DESCRIPTION	CURRENT LEVEL OF 1981-82 GENERAL FUND BUDGET COMMITMENT	PROPOSED REDUCTION	ASCENDING BALANCE	COMMENTS
1	Eliminate Project CATCH	$64,000	$64,000 (100%)	$64,000	Discontinues Outdoor Alternative School
2	Team Sports: Increase Spectator Fees	$1.7 million	$50,000	$114,000	No reduction in program but an increase in spectator fees to replace general fund monies
3	Eliminate Individual/Team Sports	$175,000	$175,000 (100%)	$289,000	Eliminates gymnastics, swimming, golf and tennis or optional freshman/JV team sports
4	Further Reduce Custodial Services	Custodial Payroll: $ 8.7 million	$1,000,000 (11.5%)	$1,289,000	Diminishes custodial service in all District buildings (beyond earlier reduction defined in 1981-82 budget)
5	Further Reduce Maintenance Services	Maintenance Payroll: $7 million Outside Contracted Services: $1.1 million	$500,000 (6.2%)	$1,789,000	Reduces/defers contracted building maintenance services
6	Further reduce Central and Area Administrative Support Services	•Central/Area Administration $3.49 million •Central Business Support $3.7 million •Other Central Services $3.47 million	$400,000 (3.8%)	$2,189,000	Reduces Central and Area Administrative Support Services by an additional 3.8% beyond the 10% reduction already taken for 1981-82
7	Eliminate ESL Middle School Newcomer Program	Total ESL Program: $4.4 million	$500,000 (11.4%)	$2,689,000	Eliminates new phase of ESL program development for 1981-82
8	Adjust H.S. FTE	$23 million	$850,000 (3.7%)	$3,539,000	Adjusts H.S. FTE to approximately 18.5:1 (about 43 FTE)
9	Adjust Elementary/Middle School FTE	$45 million	$1,300,000 (2.9%)	$4,839,000	Adjusts ES/MS FTE (about 81 FTE)
10	Reduce Special Education Support Services	Total Special Education Program: $11.3 million	$130,000 (1.2%)	$4,969,000	Eliminates projected program net budget increase (over 1980-81)
11	Reduce Desegregation/Integration Support Services	Total Desegregation Program: $3.8 million	$85,000 (2.2% of total)	$5,054,000	Combined with reduction in #6; reduces total Desegregation/Integration support by approximately 5%
12	Eliminate Child Development Specialist Program (except Longitudinal Study Schools, Area II)	$29,000	$29,000 (100% of program except longitudinal study)	$5,083,000	District's commitment to SDE for five year longitudinal study will be honored
13	Eliminate Talented and Gifted Program	$330,000	$330,000 (100%)	$5,413,000	Indicated general fund reduction would end state categorical fund support
14	Reduce H.S. Magnets	$1.3 million	$130,000 (10%)	$5,543,000	Applicable to all existing H.S. magnet programs
15	Further adjust H.S. FTE	$22.15 million (after 8)	$850,000 (3.8%)	$6,393,000	Further adjusts H.S. FTE to 19.5:1 (about 43 FTE) (see #8)
16	Eliminate Elementary Music *	$1,187,000	$913,000 (100%)	$7,306,000	Would end all K-8 non homeroom music instruction; does not include middle school (41 FTE)
17	Eliminate Elementary P.E. *	$1,036,000	$797,000 (100%)	$8,103,000	Same as above (43 FTE)
18	Eliminate Elementary Home Ec. *	$363,000	$279,000 (100%)	$8,382,000	Same as above (13 FTE)
19	Eliminate Elementary Industrial Ed. *	$420,000	$323,000 (100%)	$8,705,000	Same as above (14.8 FTE)
20	Eliminate Preschool (except * Federally Funded portion)	$786,000	$605,000 (100%)	$9,310,000	Would end pre-kindergarten programs for approximately 300 4 years olds (33.7 FTE)
21	Eliminate Kindergarten (except * ECEC's and CDP Target Schools)	$1,200,000	$923,000 (100%)	$10,233,000	Would end kindergarten programs except at indicated sites (57 FTE)
See Comment Section	Eliminate TRFA/PERS Merger Reserve	Principal: $3,400,000 Interest: $1,968,780	$5,368,780 (100%)	$15,601,780	This category should be examined as an option at any point in the sequence of proposed priorities shown above.
				GT $15,601,780	

* Net savings are less than present (1981-82) general fund commitments where FTE are involved. Relevant provisions of the PAT negotiated contract, when implemented, result in this effect. This is a function of the seniority provision, in particular.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Reducing the Cost of Quality Education

This look at some longer-term creative solutions to school cost reductions will explore a set of variables that represent those current costs of schooling which can be manipulated independently or in combinations to produce cost reductions. These include:

a) School year
b) School day
c) Staffing
d) Community and parent resources
e) Attendance requirements
f) Salary policies
g) Program
h) Scheduling of programs
i) Facilities, space
j) Control of learning process
k) Support systems, services, materials
l) Meta-system requirements (teacher certificates, textbook adoptions, state standards, federal guidelines)

In this section of the paper five ideas for cost reductions are developed that exemplify (but by no means exhaust) the type of thinking about such variables and their interactions that are needed if we are to meet the threat that the decline in resources poses for our traditional structures for education. The five ideas to be explored briefly are:

1. Increase pupil self-directed learning.

2. Develop an extensive work experience program.

3. Set and enforce requirements for effort and performance on the part of students beyond the 8th grade and possibly even the 6th grade.

4. Extend cooperative relations between school systems and community colleges and universities.

5. Establish more extensive relations with cultural institutions, service agencies, businesses and individuals in the community capable of providing unique and valuable educational experiences to young people; e.g., musical organizations, art organizations, public agencies, manufacturers, and self-employed individuals.

A more systematic review of potentials for change involving one or more of these variables could generate still further ideas of the type presented below.

1. Increase pupil self-directed learning.

Students who demonstrate both the ability and desire to take more responsibility for their own education would be provided greater opportunity to control and direct their own learning based upon objectives, reading assignments, etc., worked out with teachers or other designated persons. Space would be provided for these students to pursue their studies independent of teacher supervision. Student supervision of learning areas could be employed. Savings in the magnitude of perhaps 10% to 20% might be achieved in teacher cost, assuming that approximately 25%

of the students in a typical school might be able, over a period of time, to assume effective control of their own learning with teachers, counselors, citizens, librarians, etc., available as resources for consultation during certain hours of the day.

2. Development of extensive work experience program.

A school district would work with its community to establish much more extensive paid student work experience programs, both school and non-school related, beginning pehaps as early as the 4th grade. The rationale is to create higher levels of personal confidence and feelings of worth to society among students by subjecting them consistently to the realities of work-for-pay, personal economics, and social expectations for responsibility and effectiveness.

Current work experience programs lack both the scope and philosophic commitment required to make them a major element of public schooling. They need to be expanded to become a central part of the education of all students if they are to bridge the gap between academic learning and real life. As things now stand, the prolonged dependency to which young people are subjected, combined with the impotency of schools in enforcing standards of effort and performance, permits and encourages development of undesirable social and work attitudes on the part of too many students attending school.

3. Set and enforce requirements for effort and performance on the part of students beyond the 8th grade and possibly even the 6th grade.

Students whose personal effort and learning productivity do not in any reasonable sense justify the public expenditure made for their education would be excluded from school for a designated period of time (perhaps a year). The exclusion would not be viewed as a punitive measure, but as a period in which the parent and child could find alternatives to public education more likely to produce learning of personal and social value. Separation from school, selection of alternatives, and readmittance would be a routine counseling arrangment between the school, child, and parent. This proposal would involve the development of work opportunities in the community and in the school system. It now costs about $2,500 a year to educate a student. Many students would probably opt to work for a year to earn $2,500 or even less, and if work experiences could be provided on a part- or full-time basis, and earnings were contingent upon satisfactory work performance, desirable social and work attitudes should develop. Students who exhibit neither the desire to learn in school nor interest in working productively for pay would be dismissed from the system with options to return at any time attitudes and performances changed.

4. Extend cooperative relations between school systems and community colleges and universities.

Existing programs would be expanded that provide opportunities for students in the junior and senior years of high school to attend community colleges and universities for credit. This would focus mainly on elective offerings. Expansion of these programs could make it possible to reduce the number of electives offered, along with their low pupil-teacher ratios and high costs.

5. Establish more extensive relations with institutions, service agencies and individuals in the community capable of providing unique and valuable educational experiences to young people; e.g., musical organizations, art organizations, public agencies, and self-employed individuals.

Relationships with cultural organizations could result in students receiving instruction or engaging in regularly scheduled educational experiences through other agencies. Relationships with service agencies such as hospitals, nursing homes, and local government could provide supervised experiences that certainly would result in development of desirable social attitudes and work habits on a credit basis, if not on a paid basis. Relations with self-employed individuals could provide students opportunities to do research or assist practitioners in a wide variety of socially useful endeavors.

Conclusion

There are no easy answers, in either the long or short run, to the question of how to do more with less. The fact is, however, that at least for a time, the management of growth in education must give way to the tasks of decline. For now we must concentrate on finding new ways to gain and hold community support and new ways to cut, close, constrict and consolidate. It is to be hoped that out of this task two things will emerge. First, leaner, tougher, smarter educational systems that are well equiped to use every ounce of resources they can muster in order to help children learn, including any new resources that may come our way when and if there is another side to this "hardtimes hill" we are climbing together. Second, new, creative ideas and approaches for helping learning to happen that are more effective as well as more efficient than anything we now know.

References

Benson, C. S. Investment and disinvestment in public education. In Restoring confidence in public education: An agenda for the 1980s. Washington, D.C.: The National Urban Coalition, 1979.

Bins, M., & Townsel, A. Changing/declining enrollments in large city school systems. In S. Abramowitz and S. Rosenfeld (Eds.). Declining enrollments: The challenge of the coming decade. Washington, D.C.: DHEW, National Institute of Education, 1978.

Borcherding, T. (Ed.) Budget and bureaucrat: The sources of government growth. Durham: Duke University Press, 1977.

Boyd, W. L. The public, the professionals, and educational policy-making: Who governs? Teachers College Record, 77 (4), 539-577.

Brazer, H., et al. Fiscal needs and resources. Unpublished consultants' report
to the New York State Commission on the Cost, Quality and Financing of Elementary and Secondary Education, 1971.

Cibulka, James G. Decline in Urban Systems. Paper Presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Los Angeles, Calif., April 1981.

Fringe benefits for teachers in public schools, 1977-78. Educational Research Service. Arlington, Va., 1979.

Grubb, N., & Michelson, S. States and schools: The political economy of school finance. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1974.

Gurwitz, A. The financial condition of urban school districts: A federal policy perspective. Santa Monica, Calif.: The RAND Corporation, 1977.

James, H. T. Decline in school population predicted. Compact, 2 (6), 3, 1968.

Kahn, G., & Hughes, W. A. Statistics of local public school systems' finances, 1967-68. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Health Education and Welfare, 1970.

Knezevich, S., & Fowlkes, J. Business management in local school systems. New York: Harper, 1960.

Peterson, P. E. The politics of American education. In F. N. Kerlinger and J. B. Carroll (Eds.), Review of Research in Education, 2. Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock, 348-389, 1977.

Reischauer, R. The federal government's role in relieving cities of the fiscal burdens of concentration of low income persons. National Tax Journal, 29 (3), 1976.

Townsel, A., & Hamilton, E. Financing public education; the threat of disinvestment. Restoring confidence in public education: An agenda for the 1980s. Washington, D.C.: The National Urban Coalition, 1979.